arXiv:1702.06305v1 [math.OC] 21 Feb 2017

MATRIX FACTORIZATIONS OF CORRELATION MATRICES AND APPLICATIONS

ANUPAM PRAKASH AND ANTONIOS VARVITSIOTIS

Abstract. We introduce a notion of matrix valued Gram decompositions for correlation matrices whose study is motivated by quantum information theory. We show that for extremal correlations, the matrices in such a factorization generate a Clifford algebra and thus, their size is exponential in terms of the rank of the correlation matrix. Using this we give a self-contained and succinct proof of the existence of completely positive semidefinite matrices with sub-exponential cpsd-rank, recently derived in [11, 5]. This fact also underlies and generalizes Tsirelson's seminal lower bound on the local dimension of a quantum system necessary to generate an extreme quantum correlation.

1. Introduction

The *correlation matrix* for a family of random variables $X_1, \dots, X_n$ is the $n \times n$ matrix whose (i, j) entry is equal to the correlation between X_i and X_j, *i.e.*,

$$\mathbb{E}[(X_i - \mu_i)(X_j - \mu_j)]/\sigma_i\sigma_j,$$

where μ_i, σ_i denote the mean and standard deviation of X_i. Correlation matrices capture the association between random variables and their use is ubiquitous in statistics.

It is easy to verify that correlation matrices are positive semidefinite and have all diagonal entries equal to one. Conversely, any such matrix can be expressed as a correlation matrix for some family of random variables. Thus, the set of $n \times n$ correlation matrices coincides with the n-dimensional *elliptope*, denoted by $\mathcal{E}_n$, defined as the set of $n \times n$ symmetric positive semidefinite matrices with diagonal entries equal to one, *i.e.*,

$$\mathcal{E}_n := \{E \succeq 0 : E_{ii} = 1 \ (i \in [n])\}.$$

The elliptope is a spectrahedral set whose structure has been extensively studied (*e.g.* see [3] and references therein). Its significance is illustrated by the fact that it corresponds to the feasible region of various semidefinite programs that are used to approximate NP-hard combinatorial optimization problems (*e.g.* MAX-CUT [4]).

In this work we mostly consider $\mathcal{E}_{n+m}$, *i.e.*, the elliptope of size $n + m$. Each matrix in $\mathcal{E}_{n+m}$ admits a block decomposition $\left(\begin{smallmatrix} A & C \\ C^\mathsf{T} & B \end{smallmatrix}\right)$, where $A \in \mathcal{E}_n$, $B \in \mathcal{E}_m$ and $C = (c_{ij}) \in [-1, 1]^{n\times m}$. For any $E \in \mathcal{E}_{n+m}$ we write $E = \mathrm{Gram}(\{a_i\}_{i=1}^n, \{b_j\}_{j=1}^m)$ to indicate that the vectors $a_1, \dots, a_n, b_1, \dots, b_m$ form a *Gram decomposition* for E, *i.e.*,

$$A_{ij} = \langle a_i, a_j\rangle, \ \forall i, j \in [n], \quad B_{ij} = \langle b_i, b_j\rangle, \ \forall i, j \in [m], \text{ and}$$

$$c_{ij} = \langle a_i, b_j\rangle, \quad \text{for all } i \in [n], j \in [m].$$

As it turns out, the image of the elliptope $\mathcal{E}_{n+m}$ under the projection operator

$$\pi : \mathcal{S}_{n+m} \to \mathbb{R}^{n\times m}, \quad \begin{pmatrix} A & C \\ C^\mathsf{T} & B \end{pmatrix} \mapsto C, \tag{1}$$

is of central importance to quantum information theory. The set $\pi(\mathcal{E}_{n+m})$ is known as the set of (n, m) *bipartite correlation matrices*. This connection is explained in Section 4.

In this work we introduce and study matrix factorizations of a specific form for correlation matrices. As explained below, such factorizations can be used to study a newly introduced notion of matrix rank relevant to quantum information theory. Informally, our main result is that for *extreme points* of the set of correlation matrices, the matrices in such a factorization generate a Clifford algebra.

Recall that the *rank-n Clifford algebra*, denoted by $\mathcal{C}_n$, is the universal C^*-algebra generated by Hermitian indeterminates $z_1, \ldots, z_n$ satisfying the following relations:

$$z_i z_j + z_j z_i = 2\delta_{ij} I, \quad \text{for all } i, j \in [n]. \tag{2}$$

Furthermore, it is well-known that depending on the parity of n, the algebra $\mathcal{C}_n$ has either one or two irreducible representations, each of dimension $2^{\lfloor n/2 \rfloor}$, *e.g.*, see [4, Chapter 6].

Having introduced Clifford algebras, we now formally state our main technical result:

Theorem 1.1. *Let* $E = \left(\begin{smallmatrix} A & C \\ C^\intercal & B \end{smallmatrix}\right)$ *be an extreme point of* $\mathcal{E}_{n+m}$ *where* $\operatorname{rank}(A) = \operatorname{rank}(E) = n$. *Consider* $d \times d$ *Hermitian matrices* $\{X_i\}_{i=1}^n, \{Y_j\}_{j=1}^m, K$ *satisfying*

- (i) $E = \operatorname{Gram}(KX_1, \ldots, KX_n, Y_1K, \ldots, Y_mK)$;
- (ii) $X_i^2 = Y_j^2 = I_d$, *for all* $i \in [n], j \in [m]$;
- (iii) $\operatorname{Tr}(K^2) = 1$ *and* K *is positive definite.*

Then, the algebra $\mathbb{C}[X_1, \ldots, X_n]$ *is isomorphic to the rank-n Clifford algebra* $\mathcal{C}_n$. *In particular, the size of the matrices* $X_1, \ldots, X_n$ *is lower bounded by* $2^{\lfloor n/2 \rfloor}$.

Throughout this work, we refer to any family of matrices $\{X_i\}_{i=1}^n, \{Y_j\}_{j=1}^m, K$ satisfying conditions $(i), (ii)$ and (iii) above as a *matrix factorization of the correlation matrix* E.

The proof of Theorem 1.1 is given in Section 2.3. As we explain in Section 4, Theorem 1.1 is related to Tsirelson's results concerning the structure of the quantum state and the observables that are necessary to generate an extremal quantum correlation matrix.

A few comments are in order concerning the statement of Theorem 1.1. First, there exists a rank-n extreme point of $\mathcal{E}_{n+m}$ if and only if $m \geq \binom{n}{2}$. This is a consequence of some well-known facts concerning extreme points of the elliptope which we review in Section 2.1 and will be satisfied whenever we apply Theorem 1.1. Second, although not immediately obvious, we will see in Lemma 2.6 that any correlation matrix admits such a matrix factorization (where we can even always take K to be a multiple of the identity).

Also, it is worth noting that Theorem 1.1 remains valid when (i) is replaced with:

- (i') $E = \operatorname{Gram}(KX_1, \ldots, KX_n, KY_1, \ldots, KY_m)$.

and also when $(i), (ii)$ and (iii) are replaced with:

- (i'') $E = \operatorname{Gram}(A_1, \ldots, A_n, B_1, \ldots, B_m)$;
- (ii'') $A_i^2 = B_j^2 = \frac{1}{d} I_d$, for all $i \in [n], j \in [m]$.

Lastly, we note in passing that representations of generalized Clifford algebras (associated with a real zero polynomial) are related to the existence of determinantal representations of (powers of) hyperbolic polynomials, *e.g.* see [9, 10]. It is an interesting question if representations of generalized Clifford algebras are related in a similar manner to other spectrahedra, more general than the elliptope.

Applications to the cpsd-rank. An $n \times n$ matrix X is called *completely positive semidefinite* (cpsd) if there exist $d \times d$ Hermitian positive semidefinite matrices $\{P_i\}_{i=1}^n$ (for some $d \geq 1$) satisfying

$$X_{ij} = \operatorname{Tr}(P_i P_j), \text{ for all } i, j \in [n]. \tag{3}$$

The set of $n \times n$ cpsd matrices is a convex cone denoted by $\mathcal{CS}_+^n$. The *completely positive semidefinite rank* (cpsd-rank) of a matrix $X \in \mathcal{CS}_+^n$, denoted by cpsd-rank(X),

is defined as the least $d \geq 1$ for which there exist $d \times d$ Hermitian psd matrices $P_1, \ldots, P_d$ such that $X_{ij} = \mathrm{Tr}(P_i P_j)$, for all $i, j \in [n]$.

We use Theorem 1.1 to give a succinct and self-contained proof of the existence of cpsd matrices whose cpsd-rank is sub-exponential in terms of their size. Specifically, we recover the following result that was recently shown in [11], and independently in [5].

Theorem 1.2 ([11, 5]). *For any $n \in \mathbb{N}$ there exists a matrix $X_n \in \mathcal{CS}_+^{2n}$ such that*

$$\text{cpsd-rank}(X_n) \geq 2^{\lfloor r_{\max}(n)/2 \rfloor}, \tag{4}$$

where $r_{\max}(n)$ is the greatest integer satisfying $\binom{r+1}{2} \leq n$, i.e.,

$$r_{\max}(n) = \left\lfloor \frac{\sqrt{1+8n}-1}{2} \right\rfloor.$$

Both proofs of Theorem 1.2 were obtained using Tsirelson's results [15] as a black-box, which we replace by Theorem 1.1. The value of this alternative proof is that it bypasses all the "quantum overhead" that was used in the original proofs [11, 5] and as such, it makes it accessible to the broader mathematical community. Additionally, our new proof puts forward matrix factorizations of the ellitope as a useful mathematical tool.

The study of the cpsd cone and the cpsd-rank is motivated by physical considerations Specifically, the set of $n \times n$ cpsd matrices is a convex cone that was recently introduced to provide linear conic formulations for the quantum analogues of various classical graph parameters [7, 12]. Subsequently, it was shown in [13] that the set of quantum behaviors can be expressed as the projection of an affine section of the cpsd cone. Additionally, the cpsd-rank can be used to upper and lower bound the size of a quantum system needed to generate a quantum behavior [11].

Furthermore, from the perspective of conic optimization, the cpsd-rank is a natural non-commutative analogue of the well-studied notion of the completely positive rank [2].

Relation to Tsirelson's work. In his seminal work [15], Tsirelson showed that the set of bipartite correlation matrices $\pi(\mathcal{E}_{n+m})$ coincides with the set of correlations that can be obtained by performing local measurements on a bipartite quantum system; for details see Section 4. Furthermore, he studied matrix factorizations of bipartite correlation matrices that have operational interpretation within the context of quantum information theory.

Among other things, Tsirelson showed in [15] that for extremal correlations, the matrices in such a factorization (in the finite-dimensional case) generate an appropriate Clifford algebra, and as a consequence, their size can be lower bounded.

The proof of Theorem 1.1 uses ideas from Tsirelson's work but, as we show in Section 4, it strictly generalizes Tsirelson's structure theorem. Furthermore, Theorem 1.1 provides an alternative interpretation of Tsirelson's results, by highlighting matrix factorizations of the elliptope as the underlying mathematical object.

1.1. Preliminaries.

In this section we introduce the most important definitions, notation and background material that we use throughout this paper.

Linear Algebra. Throughout, we use the shorthand notation $\{x_i\}_{i=1}^n := \{x_1, \ldots, x_n\}$ and $[n] := \{1, \ldots, n\}$. We denote by $\{e_i\}_{i=1}^n$ the standard basis of $\mathbb{C}^n$. The canonical inner product of two vectors $x, y \in \mathbb{R}^n$ is denoted by $\langle x, y \rangle$. We write $\mathrm{span}(\{x_i\}_{i=1}^n)$ for the linear span of the vectors $\{x_i\}_{i=1}^n$.

We denote by $\mathcal{M}_d$ the set of $d \times d$ complex matrices and by $\mathcal{H}_d$ (resp. $\mathcal{S}_d$) the set of $d \times d$ Hermitian (resp. symmetric) matrices. Given a matrix $X \in \mathcal{M}_d$, its transpose is denoted by X^T and its conjugate transpose by X^*. Furthermore, we denote by $X \otimes Y$

the Kronecker product of X and Y. Throughout, we equip $\mathcal{H}_d$ with the Hilbert-Schmidt inner product $\langle X, Y\rangle := \mathrm{Tr}(XY^*)$. For a block matrix $X = \left(\begin{smallmatrix} A & C \\ C^\intercal & B \end{smallmatrix}\right) \in \mathcal{S}_{n+m}$ we use that

$$\mathrm{rank}(X) = \mathrm{rank}(A) \iff \exists\ n \times m \text{ matrix } \Lambda \text{ such that } C = A\Lambda \text{ and } B = \Lambda^\intercal A \Lambda. \tag{5}$$

A matrix $X \in \mathcal{H}_d$ is called *positive semidefinite* (psd) if $\psi^* X \psi \geq 0$, for all $\psi \in \mathbb{C}^d$. The set of $d \times d$ Hermitian psd (resp. symmetric psd) matrices forms a closed convex cone denoted by $\mathcal{H}_+^d$ (resp. $\mathcal{S}_+^d$). We sometimes also write $X \succeq 0$ to indicate that X is psd.

The *Gram matrix* of a family of vectors $\{x_i\}_{i=1}^n \subseteq \mathbb{R}^d$, denoted by $\mathrm{Gram}(x_1, \ldots, x_n)$ or $\mathrm{Gram}(\{x_i\}_{i=1}^n)$, is the symmetric $n \times n$ matrix whose (i, j) entry is given by $\langle x_i, x_j\rangle$, for all $i, j \in [n]$. It is easy to see that an $n \times n$ matrix X is positive semidefinite if and only if there exist vectors $x_1, \ldots, x_n \in \mathbb{R}^k$ (for some $k \geq 1$) such that $X = \mathrm{Gram}(x_1, \ldots, x_n)$. For any Gram matrix we have that $\mathrm{rank}\left(\mathrm{Gram}(\{x_i\}_{i=1}^n)\right) = \dim(\mathrm{span}(\{x_i\}_{i=1}^n))$. Lastly, if $X = \mathrm{Gram}(x_1, \ldots, x_n)$ we make use the following property:

$$\text{For any } \lambda \in \mathbb{R}^n : X\lambda = 0 \iff \sum_{i=1}^n x_i \lambda_i = 0. \tag{6}$$

We use a well-known correspondence between $\mathcal{M}_d$ and $\mathbb{C}^d \otimes \mathbb{C}^d$ given by the map $\mathrm{vec} : \mathcal{M}_d \to \mathbb{C}^d \otimes \mathbb{C}^d$, which is given by $\mathrm{vec}(e_i e_j^*) = e_i \otimes e_j$, on basis vectors and is extended linearly. The $\mathrm{vec}(\cdot)$ map is an isometry, *i.e.*, $\langle X, Y\rangle = \langle \mathrm{vec}(Y), \mathrm{vec}(X)\rangle$ for all $X, Y \in \mathcal{M}_d$. We also need the following fact:

$$\mathrm{vec}(W)^*(X \otimes Y)\mathrm{vec}(Z) = \mathrm{vec}(W)^*\mathrm{vec}(XZY^\intercal) = \langle W, XZY^\intercal\rangle, \tag{7}$$

Any vector $\psi \in \mathbb{C}^d \otimes \mathbb{C}^d$ can be uniquely expressed as $\psi = \sum_{i=1}^d \lambda_i\, y_i \otimes x_i$ for some integer $d \geq 1$, positive scalars $\{\lambda_i\}_{i=1}^d$, and orthonormal sets $\{y_i\}_{i=1}^d \subseteq \mathbb{C}^d$ and $\{x_i\}_{i=1}^d \subseteq \mathbb{C}^d$. An expression of this form is known as a *Schmidt decomposition* for ψ and is derived by the singular value decomposition of $\mathrm{vec}^{-1}(\psi)$. Note that if $\psi = \sum_{i=1}^d \lambda_i\, y_i \otimes x_i$ is a Schmidt decomposition for ψ, then we have that $\|\psi\|_2^2 = \sum_{i=1}^d \lambda_i^2$.

The *Pauli matrices* are given by

$$I_2 := \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix},\ X := \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1 \\ 1 & 0 \end{pmatrix},\ Y := \begin{pmatrix} 0 & -i \\ i & 0 \end{pmatrix},\ \text{ and }\ Z := \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & -1 \end{pmatrix}.$$

Note that the (non-identity) Pauli matrices are Hermitian, their trace is equal to zero, they have ± 1 eigenvalues and they pairwise anti-commute.

Clifford algebras. Throughout this section set $d := 2^{\lfloor r/2\rfloor}$. It is well-known that

$$\mathcal{C}_r \cong \mathcal{M}_d, \quad \text{for even } r, \quad \text{and} \quad \mathcal{C}_r \cong \mathcal{M}_d \oplus \mathcal{M}_d, \quad \text{for odd } r. \tag{8}$$

For a proof of this fact and additional details the reader is referred to [4, Chapter 6]. An explicit representation of $\mathcal{C}_r$ is obtained using the Brauer-Weyl matrices. Specifically, for $r = 2\ell$, the map $\gamma_r : \mathcal{C}_r \to \mathcal{H}_d$ given by

$$\gamma_r(z_i) = Z^{\otimes(i-1)} \otimes X \otimes I_2^{\otimes(\ell-i)} \in \mathcal{H}_d,\ (i \in [\ell]), \tag{9}$$

and

$$\gamma_r(z_{i+\ell}) = Z^{\otimes(i-1)} \otimes Y \otimes I_2^{\otimes(\ell-i)} \in \mathcal{H}_d,\ (i \in [\ell]). \tag{10}$$

is a complex representation of $\mathcal{C}_r$. Furthermore, in the case where $r = 2\ell + 1$ we define $\{\gamma_r(z_i)\}_{i=1}^{2\ell}$ as described in (9) and (10) and additionally set $\gamma_r(z_{2\ell+1}) = Z^{\otimes\ell}$.

Lastly, we collect some properties of the map γ_r which will be crucial for our results in the next section. Specifically, setting $d = 2^{\lfloor r/2\rfloor}$, for all $x, y \in \mathbb{R}^n$ we have the following:

$$\gamma_r(x)^2 = \|x\|^2 I_d \qquad \text{and} \qquad d\langle x, y\rangle = \mathrm{Tr}\left(\gamma_r(x)\gamma_r(y)\right). \tag{11}$$

Convexity. A set $C \subseteq \mathbb{R}^n$ is *convex* if for all $a, b \in C$ and $\lambda \in [0,1]$ we have that $\lambda a + (1-\lambda)b \in C$. A subset $F \subseteq C$ is called a *face* of C if $\lambda c_1 + (1-\lambda)c_2 \in F$ implies that $c_1, c_2 \in F$, for all $c_1, c_2 \in C$ and $\lambda \in [0,1]$. We say that c is an *extreme point* of the convex set C if the singleton $\{c\}$ is a face of C. We denote by $\text{ext}(C)$ the set of extreme points of the convex set C. By the Krein-Milman theorem, any compact convex subset of $\mathbb{R}^n$ is equal to the convex hull of its extreme points, *e.g.* see [1].

2. Correlation matrices, extreme points and matrix factorizations

2.1. **Extreme correlation matrices and quadratic maps.** An *operator valued quadratic map* is a function $Q : \mathbb{R}^r \to \mathcal{H}_d$ (for some $d \geq 1$) such that $Q(ax) = a^2 Q(x)$, for all $x \in \mathbb{R}^r$ and $a \in \mathbb{R}$. The following result, observed already in [15], will be crucial.

Lemma 2.1. *Consider vectors* $\{u_i\}_{i=1}^n \subseteq \mathbb{R}^r$ *satisfying* $\text{span}(u_1, \ldots, u_n) = \mathbb{R}^r$ *and*

$$\text{span}\left(u_1 u_1^\mathsf{T}, \ldots, u_n u_n^\mathsf{T}\right) = \mathcal{S}_r. \tag{12}$$

Then, for any operator valued quadratic map $Q : \mathbb{R}^r \to \mathcal{H}_d$ *we have that*

$$Q(u_i) = 0, \quad \textit{for all } i \in [n] \implies Q = 0. \tag{13}$$

Proof. First consider the case $d = 1$, *i.e.*, we have a quadratic form $Q : \mathbb{R}^r \to \mathbb{R}$. Let $M_Q \in \mathcal{S}_r$ be the symmetric matrix, corresponding to the bilinear form associated to Q, with respect to the standard basis $\{e_i\}_{i=1}^r$ of $\mathbb{R}^r$. By assumption (13) we have that $Q(u_i) = u_i^\mathsf{T} M_Q u_i = 0$ for all $i \in [n]$ and thus, (12) implies that $M_Q = 0$. For the case $d > 1$, since $\mathcal{H}_d$ is a d^2-dimensional vector space over the real numbers, we can equivalently view Q as a quadratic form $Q : \mathbb{R}^r \to \mathbb{R}^{d^2}$ where $x \mapsto (Q_1(x), \ldots, Q_{d^2}(x))$. As all the Q_i's are real valued quadratic forms, the proof is concluded from the base case. □

Next, we recall the following well-known characterization of the extreme points of $\mathcal{E}_n$.

Theorem 2.2 ([8])**.** *Consider* $E \in \mathcal{E}_n$ *with* $r = \text{rank}(E)$ *and let* $E = \text{Gram}(\{u_i\}_{i=1}^n)$ *where* $u_i \in \mathbb{R}^r$*. Then* $E \in \text{ext}(\mathcal{E}_n)$ *if and only if*

$$\text{span}\left(u_1 u_1^\mathsf{T}, \ldots, u_n u_n^\mathsf{T}\right) = \mathcal{S}_r. \tag{14}$$

Equivalently, we have that $E \in \text{ext}(\mathcal{E}_n)$ *if and only if*

$$\text{rank}(E \circ E) = \binom{\text{rank}(E)+1}{2}, \tag{15}$$

where $X \circ Y$ *denotes the entrywise product of* X *and* Y*.*

Combining Lemma 2.1 with Theorem 2.2 we have the following useful result.

Theorem 2.3. *Consider* $E \in \text{ext}(\mathcal{E}_n)$ *with* $r = \text{rank}(E)$ *and let* $E = \text{Gram}(\{u_i\}_{i=1}^n)$ *where* $\text{span}(\{u_i\}_{i=1}^n) = \mathbb{R}^r$*. For any two operator valued quadratic maps* $Q_1, Q_2 : \mathbb{R}^r \to \mathcal{H}_d$ *(for some* $d \geq 1$*) satisfying* $Q_1(u_i) = Q_2(u_i)$*, for all* $i \in [n]$ *we have that* $Q_1 = Q_2$*.*

Proof. Consider the operator valued quadratic form $Q := Q_1 - Q_2$. By assumption we have that $Q(u_i) = 0$ for all $i \in [n]$. As $E \in \text{ext}(\mathcal{E}_n)$, by Theorem 2.2 we have that (14) holds. Lastly, Lemma 2.1 implies that $Q = 0$. □

2.2. **Bipartite correlation matrices.** By definition of π (recall (1)) and $\mathcal{E}_{n+m}$ we have:

$$\pi(\mathcal{E}_{n+m}) = \left\{C \in [-1,1]^{n\times m} : c_{ij} = \langle u_i, v_j\rangle, \quad \text{where} \quad \|u_i\| = \|v_j\| = 1, \ \forall i,j\right\}. \tag{16}$$

Given a bipartite correlation matrix $C \in \pi(\mathcal{E}_{n+m})$, any $E \in \mathcal{E}_{n+m}$ with $\pi(X) = C$ is called a *completion* of C. As was shown in [15], all equality constraints in (16) can be relaxed with inequalities, without enlarging the set. For completeness, we give a proof in the Appendix.

Lemma 2.4 ([15])**.** *For all $n, m \geq 1$ we have that*

$$\pi(\mathcal{E}_{n+m}) = \left\{C \in [-1,1]^{n\times m} : c_{ij} = \langle u_i, v_j\rangle, \quad \textit{where} \quad \|u_i\|, \|v_i\| \leq 1, \ \forall i,j\right\}. \tag{17}$$

Given a bipartite correlation $C \in \pi(\mathcal{E}_{n+m})$, any family of vectors $\{u_i\}_{i=1}^n, \{v_j\}_{j=1}^m$ satisfying $c_{ij} = \langle u_i, v_j\rangle$ and $\|u_i\|, \|v_j\| \leq 1$, for all $i \in [n], j \in [m]$ is called a *C-system*.

In the next result we summarize some basic properties of the set of completions of extreme bipartite correlations. For completeness, we give a short proof in the Appendix.

Lemma 2.5 ([15])**.** *For any $C = (c_{ij}) \in \mathrm{ext}(\pi(\mathcal{E}_{n+m}))$ we have that:*

(i) All C-systems necessarily consist of unit vectors;

(ii) For any C-system $\{u_i\}_{i=1}^n, \{v_j\}_{j=1}^m$ we have that $\mathrm{span}(\{u_i\}_{i=1}^n) = \mathrm{span}(\{v_j\}_{j=1}^m)$;

(iii) There exists a unique matrix $E_C \in \mathcal{E}_{n+m}$ satisfying $\pi(E_C) = C$. Furthermore, we have $E_C = \left(\begin{smallmatrix} A & C \\ C^\intercal & B \end{smallmatrix}\right) \in \mathrm{ext}(\mathcal{E}_{n+m})$ and $\mathrm{rank}(E_C) = \mathrm{rank}(A) = \mathrm{rank}(B) = \mathrm{rank}(C)$.

2.3. **Matrix factorizations of correlation matrices.** We are finally ready to show that any correlation matrix admits a matrix factorization as defined in Theorem 1.1.

Lemma 2.6. *Consider a real symmetric matrix $E \in \mathcal{S}_{n+m}$. The following are equivalent:*

(a) $E \in \mathcal{E}_{n+m}$, i.e., there exist real unit vectors $\{a_i\}_{i=1}^n, \{b_j\}_{j=1}^m$ such that

$$E = \mathrm{Gram}(a_1, \ldots, a_n, b_1, \ldots, b_m).$$

(b) There exist $d \times d$ Hermitian matrices $\{A_i\}_{i=1}^n, \{B_j\}_{j=1}^m$ such that

(i) $E = \mathrm{Gram}(A_1, \ldots, A_n, B_1, \ldots, B_m)$;

(ii) $A_i^2 = B_j^2 = \frac{1}{d} I_d$, for all $i \in [n], j \in [m]$.

(c) There exist $d \times d$ Hermitian matrices $\{X_i\}_{i=1}^n, \{Y_j\}_{j=1}^m, K$ such that

(i) $E = \mathrm{Gram}(KX_1, \ldots, KX_n, Y_1K, \ldots, Y_mK)$;

(ii) $X_i^2 = Y_j^2 = I_d$, for all $i \in [n], j \in [m]$;

(iii) $\mathrm{Tr}(K^2) = 1$ and K is positive definite.

Proof. $(a) \implies (b)$. Let $d = 2^{\lfloor r/2 \rfloor}$. By the properties of the map γ_r (recall (11)) we have that $\langle a_i, b_j\rangle = \left\langle \frac{\gamma(a_i)}{\sqrt{d}}, \frac{\gamma(b_j)}{\sqrt{d}} \right\rangle$ and $\gamma(a_i)^2 = \gamma(b_j)^2 = I_d$, for all $i \in [n], j \in [m]$.

$(b) \implies (c)$. Set $K = d^{-1/2} I_d$ and $X_i = \sqrt{d} A_i$, $Y_j = \sqrt{d} B_j$, for all $i \in [n], j \in [m]$.

$(c) \implies (a)$. For all $i \in [n]$ let $\tilde{a}_i = \mathrm{vec}(KX_i)$ and set $a_i = (\mathrm{Re}(\tilde{a}_i), \mathrm{Im}(\tilde{a}_i))$. For all $j \in [m]$ define $\tilde{b}_j$ and b_j analogously. As the entries of E are real numbers we have that $E = \mathrm{Gram}(a_1, \ldots, a_n, b_1, \ldots, b_m)$. Lastly, note that

$$1 = \mathrm{Tr}(K^2) = \mathrm{Tr}(X_i^2 K^2) = \langle KX_i, KX_i\rangle = \|\tilde{a}_i\|^2 = \|a_i\|^2, \ \text{for all } i \in [n].$$

Similarly we have that $\|b_j\| = 1$, for all $j \in [m]$. □

We refer to any family of matrices satisfying condition (c) from Lemma 2.6 as a *matrix factorization* of E. As already described in the introduction, our goal is to show that for extreme points of $\mathcal{E}_{n+m}$, we can place a lower bound on the size of matrix factorizations, which is exponential in terms of $\operatorname{rank}(E)$. We note in passing that using the same arguments we can also lower bound matrix factorizations satisfying condition (b) from Lemma 2.6. Nevertheless, lower bounds for matrix factorizations of type (c) are stronger.

2.4. **Proof of the lower bound.** In this section we give the proof of Theorem 1.1. This will follow as a consequence of the following result.

Lemma 2.7. *Let* $E = \left(\begin{smallmatrix} A & C \\ C^{\mathsf{T}} & B \end{smallmatrix}\right)$ *be an extreme point of* $\mathcal{E}_{n+m}$ *where* $\operatorname{rank}(A) = \operatorname{rank}(E) = n$. *Consider a family of* $d \times d$ *Hermitian operators* $\{X_i\}_{i=1}^n$ *satisfying*

$$X_i^2 = I_d, \quad \text{for all } i \in [n], \quad \text{and} \quad \Big(\sum_{i=1}^n \lambda_{ij} X_i\Big)^2 = I_d, \quad \text{for all } j \in [m], \tag{18}$$

where $\Lambda = (\lambda_{ij})$ *is an* $n \times m$ *matrix satisfying* $C = A\Lambda$ *and* $B = \Lambda^{\mathsf{T}} A \Lambda$ *(the fact that such a matrix exists follows from (5)). Then we have that*

$$\Big(\sum_{i=1}^n \mu_i X_i\Big)^2 = (\mu^{\mathsf{T}} A \mu) I_d, \quad \text{for all } \mu = (\mu_i) \in \mathbb{R}^n. \tag{19}$$

In particular, the algebra $\mathbb{C}[X_1, \ldots, X_n]$ *generated by* $\{X_i\}_{i=1}^n$ *is isomorphic to the rank-*n *Clifford algebra* $\mathcal{C}_n$ *and thus, the size of the matrices* $X_1, \ldots, X_n$ *is lower bounded by* $2^{\lfloor n/2 \rfloor}$.

Proof. Consider vectors $\{a_i\}_{i=1}^n, \{b_j\}_{j=1}^m \subseteq \mathbb{R}^n$ satisfying

$$E = \operatorname{Gram}(a_1, \ldots, a_n, b_1, \ldots, b_m) \quad \text{and} \quad \operatorname{span}(\{a_i\}_{i=1}^n) = \mathbb{R}^n.$$

Using (6) combined with the fact that $C = A\Lambda$ and $B = \Lambda^{\mathsf{T}} A \Lambda$ we get

$$b_j = \sum_{i=1}^n \lambda_{ij} a_i, \quad \text{for all } j \in [m]. \tag{20}$$

For $i \in \{1, 2\}$ we define operator valued quadratic maps $Q_i : \mathbb{R}^n \to \mathcal{H}_d$ as

$$Q_1\Big(\sum_{i=1}^n \mu_i a_i\Big) := \Big(\sum_{i=1}^n \mu_i X_i\Big)^2 \quad \text{and} \quad Q_2\Big(\sum_{i=1}^n \mu_i a_i\Big) := \Big\|\sum_{i=1}^n \mu_i a_i\Big\|^2 I_d.$$

As the vectors $\{a_i\}_{i=1}^n$ form a basis of $\mathbb{R}^n$ the maps Q_1 and Q_2 are well-defined. Note that the claim (19) is equivalent to $Q_1 = Q_2$. Thus, by Theorem 2.3 it suffices to show that

$$Q_1(a_i) = Q_2(a_i), \ \forall i \in [n] \quad \text{and} \quad Q_1(b_j) = Q_2(b_j), \ \forall j \in [m]. \tag{21}$$

First, note that

$$Q_1(a_i) = X_i^2 = I_d = Q_2(a_i), \ \text{for all } i \in [n],$$

where we use that $\|a_i\| = 1$, for all $i \in [n]$. Furthermore, for all $j \in [m]$ we have

$$Q_1(b_j) = Q_1\Big(\sum_{i=1}^n \lambda_{ij} a_i\Big) = \Big(\sum_{i=1}^n \lambda_{ij} X_i\Big)^2 = I_d,$$

where for the first equality we use (20) and for the last equality (18). Similarly,

$$Q_2(b_j) = Q_2\Big(\sum_{i=1}^n \lambda_{ij} a_i\Big) = \Big\|\sum_{i=1}^n \lambda_{ij} a_i\Big\|^2 I_d = \|b_j\|^2 I_d = I_d,$$

where we use that $\|b_j\| = 1$, for all $j \in [m]$. Thus, (21) holds which in turn implies (19).

Lastly, as an immediate consequence of (19) we get that

$$X_iX_j + X_jX_i = 2A_{ij}I_d, \quad \text{for all } i,j \in [n]. \tag{22}$$

Let $A = \sum_{k=1}^{n} \lambda_k u_k u_k^{\mathsf{T}}$ be a spectral decomposition of A. By assumption A is positive definite and thus, $\lambda_k > 0$ for all $k \in [n]$. Setting

$$X'_k := \lambda_k^{-1/2} \sum_{i=1}^{n} u_k(i) X_i, \quad \text{for all } k \in [n],$$

we have that

$$X'_iX'_j + X'_jX'_i = 2\delta_{i,j}I_d, \quad \text{for all } i,j \in [n],$$

and thus $\mathbb{C}[X_1, \ldots, X_n]$ is isomorphic to the rank-n Clifford algebra $\mathcal{C}_n$. □

We are now ready to give the proof of Theorem 1.1.

Proof. (**of Theorem 1.1**) As $\operatorname{rank}(E) = \operatorname{rank}(A)$, there exists an $n \times m$ matrix $\Lambda = (\lambda_{ij})$ such that $C = A\Lambda$ and $B = \Lambda^{\mathsf{T}} A \Lambda$. Since $E = \operatorname{Gram}(KX_1, \ldots, KX_n, Y_1K, \ldots, Y_mK)$ it follows by (6) that

$$Y_jK = \sum_{i=1}^{n} \lambda_{ij} KX_i, \quad \text{for all } j \in [m],$$

and as K is positive definite (and hence invertible) we obtain

$$Y_j = \sum_{i=1}^{n} \lambda_{ij} KX_iK^{-1}, \quad \text{for all } j \in [m]. \tag{23}$$

Lastly, define

$$\tilde{X}_i = KX_iK^{-1}, \text{ for all } i \in [n].$$

By assumption we have that $X_i^2 = I_d$, for all $i \in [n]$, which implies that $\tilde{X}_i^2 = I_d$. Furthermore, as $Y_j^2 = I_d$ for all $j \in [m]$, it follows by (23) that

$$\Big(\sum_{i=1}^{n} \lambda_{ij} \tilde{X}_i \Big)^2 = I_d, \quad \text{for all } j \in [m]. \tag{24}$$

The proof of the theorem is is concluded using Lemma 2.7. □

3. Constructing matrices with sub-exponential cpsd-rank

In this section we use Theorem 1.1 to prove Theorem 1.2. The crux of the proof lies in the following result.

Theorem 3.1. *For any $C = (c_{ij}) \in \operatorname{ext}(\mathcal{E}_n)$ the matrix*

$$P_C = \sum_{i,j=1}^{n} \frac{1}{4} \begin{pmatrix} 1 + c_{ij} & 1 - c_{ij} \\ 1 - c_{ij} & 1 + c_{ij} \end{pmatrix} \otimes e_i e_j^{\mathsf{T}}, \tag{25}$$

is cpsd and furthermore, $\text{cpsd-rank}(P_C) \geq 2^{\lfloor \operatorname{rank}(C)/2 \rfloor}$.

Proof. Let $C = \operatorname{Gram}(\{u_i\}_{i=1}^n)$ where $\{u_i\}_{i=1}^n \subseteq \mathbb{R}^r$ and $\|u_i\| = 1, \forall i \in [n]$. As suggested by (25) we think of P_C as an $n \times n$ block matrix where each block has size 2×2 and is indexed by $\{\pm 1\}$.

We first show that $P_C \in \mathcal{CS}_+^{2n}$. For this, set $d = 2^{\lfloor r/2 \rfloor}$ and define

$$\Gamma_a^i = \frac{I + a\gamma_r(u_i)}{2\sqrt{d}}, \quad \text{for all } i \in [n], a \in \{\pm 1\}, \tag{26}$$

and note that by the properties of the γ_r map (recall (11)), these matrices are Hermitian psd. Furthermore, by direct calculation for all $i,j \in [n]$ and $a,b \in \{\pm 1\}$ we have that

$$\langle \Gamma_a^i, \Gamma_b^j \rangle = \frac{d + ab\langle \gamma_r(u_i), \gamma_r(u_j)\rangle}{4d} = \frac{1 + ab\langle u_i, u_j\rangle}{4} = \frac{1 + abc_{ij}}{4}, \tag{27}$$

which shows that the matrices $\{\Gamma_a^i : i \in [n], a \in \{\pm 1\}\}$ form a cpsd-factorization for P_C. Next we proceed to show the lower bound.

Let $\{P_a^i : i \in [n], a \in \{\pm 1\}\}$ be a size-optimal cpsd-factorization for P_C. We now identify some useful properties of these matrices which we use later in the proof. As the entries of P_C in each 2×2 block sum up to one we get

$$\sum_{a \in \{\pm 1\}} P_a^i = \sum_{a \in \{\pm 1\}} P_a^j, \quad \text{for all } i,j \in [n]. \tag{28}$$

For all $i \in [n]$ set

$$K := \sum_{a \in \{\pm 1\}} P_a^i, \tag{29}$$

which is well-defined by (28). Furthermore, note that K is psd and $\langle K, K\rangle = 1$.

Since the cpsd factorization is size-optimal we may assume without loss of generality that K is diagonal and positive definite. Indeed, let $K = Q\Lambda Q^*$ be its spectral decomposition. Clearly, the matrices $\{Q^* P_a^i Q : i \in [n], a \in \{\pm 1\}\}$ are Hermitian positive semidefinite and as Q is unitary, it follows that they form a cpsd-factorization for P_C. As a consequence, if K was rank-deficient, by restricting the matrices $\{Q^* P_a^i Q : i \in [n], a \in \{\pm 1\}\}$ onto the support of K, we would get another cpsd-factorization of smaller size. This contradicts the assumption that $\{P_a^i : i \in [n], a \in \{\pm 1\}\}$ was size-optimal.

Our next goal is to use the cpsd-factorization $\{P_a^i : i \in [n], a \in \{\pm 1\}\}$ to obtain the matrix factorization to which Theorem 1.1 will be applied. As K invertible we have that

$$\langle P_a^i, P_b^j \rangle = \langle K(K^{-1/2} P_a^i K^{-1/2}), (K^{-1/2} P_b^j K^{-1/2})K\rangle = \langle K\tilde{P}_a^i, \tilde{P}_b^j K\rangle, \quad \forall i,j \in [n], \tag{30}$$

where we define

$$\tilde{P}_a^i := K^{-1/2} P_a^i K^{-1/2}, \quad \text{for all } i \in [n], a \in \{\pm 1\}. \tag{31}$$

An easy calculation shows that

$$c_{ij} = \sum_{a,b \in \{\pm 1\}} ab \left(\frac{1 + abc_{ij}}{4} \right) = \sum_{a,b \in \{\pm 1\}} ab \langle P_a^i, P_b^j \rangle = \sum_{a,b \in \{\pm 1\}} ab \langle K\tilde{P}_a^i, \tilde{P}_b^j K\rangle, \tag{32}$$

where for the second equality we use that $\{P_a^i : i \in [n], a \in \{\pm 1\}\}$ is a cpsd-factorization for P_C and the third equality follows from (30). Setting

$$X_i := \tilde{P}_1^i - \tilde{P}_{-1}^i, \quad \forall i \in [n],$$

it follows by (32) that

$$c_{ij} = \langle KX_i, X_j K\rangle, \quad \forall i,j \in [n]. \tag{33}$$

By (29) we have $\sum_{a \in \{\pm 1\}} P_a^i = K$ which implies that $\tilde{P}_1^i + \tilde{P}_{-1}^i = I$, for all $i \in [n]$. Thus, for any $i \in [n]$, the Hermitian matrix $X_i = \tilde{P}_1^i - \tilde{P}_{-1}^i = 2\tilde{P}_1^i - I$ has spectrum in $[-1,1]$, *i.e.*, $X_i^2 \preceq I$. In fact, as $C \in \text{ext}(\mathcal{E}_n)$, it follows by Lemma 2.5 (i) that

$$X_i^2 = I, \quad \text{for all } i \in [n]. \tag{34}$$

Note that the same argument was given in the proof of Theorem 4.4.

We are now ready to conclude the proof. As $C \in \text{ext}(\mathcal{E}_n)$, Theorem 2.5 (iii) implies that C has a unique elliptope completion $E_C \in \mathcal{E}_{2n}$, which moreover is an extreme point

of $\mathcal{E}_{2n}$. Nevertheless, as $C \in \mathcal{E}_n$, the matrix $\left(\begin{smallmatrix} C & C \\ C & C \end{smallmatrix}\right)$ is clearly an elliptope completion of C. As a consequence we have that

$$E_C = \begin{pmatrix} C & C \\ C & C \end{pmatrix} \in \text{ext}(\mathcal{E}_{2n}), \tag{35}$$

which is the matrix to which we will apply Theorem 1.1. The last step is to exhibit a matrix factorization for E_C. For this consider the psd matrix

$$E'_C := \text{Gram}(KX_1, \ldots, KX_n, X_1K, \ldots, X_nK).$$

By (34) we have

$$\langle KX_i, KX_i \rangle = \text{Tr}(X_i^2 K^2) = \text{Tr}(K^2) = 1, \quad \forall i \in [n],$$

and thus, E'_C is an element of the elliptope $\mathcal{E}_{2n}$. Finally, by (33) it follows that E'_C is an elliptope completion of C. Thus, again by Lemma 2.5 (*iii*) we get that $E_C = E'_C$, *i.e.*,

$$\begin{pmatrix} C & C \\ C & C \end{pmatrix} = \text{Gram}(KX_1, \ldots, KX_n, X_1K, \ldots, X_nK) \in \text{ext}(\mathcal{E}_{2n}),$$

and the proof is concluded by Theorem 1.1. □

To get a proof of Theorem 1.2, it remains to combine Theorem 3.1 with the following well-known fact: For any $X \in \text{ext}(\mathcal{E}_n)$ we have that $\text{rank}(X) \leq r_{\max}(n)$. Furthermore, for any integer $r \in [1, r_{\max}(n)]$ there exists a matrix $X_r \in \text{ext}(\mathcal{E}_n)$ with $r = \text{rank}(X_r)$ [6].

4. Relation to Quantum Correlations

In this section we study quantum correlations, *i.e.*, correlations obtained by performing local measurements on a bipartite quantum system. In [15], Tsirelson derived a lower bound on the size of a quantum system necessary to generate an extremal quantum correlation. In Section 4.2 we show this lower bound can be recovered using Theorem 1.1.

4.1. Quantum Background.

The link between quantum information theory and bipartite correlation matrices is best explained within the following framework, known in the physics literature as a *Bell scenario*. Consider two parties, Alice and Bob, that share a bipartite quantum system, *e.g.,* a pair of spin-1/2 particles. According to the postulates of quantum mechanics, the *state* of a bipartite quantum system with *local dimension* d is described by a Hermitian psd matrix ρ acting on $\mathbb{C}^d \otimes \mathbb{C}^d$ with $\text{Tr}(\rho) = 1$.

Independently and simultaneously, Alice and Bob measure their part of the system and then announce the outcomes of their measurements. By the postulates of quantum mechanics, the process of measuring a d-dimensional quantum system is described by a Hermitian matrix $H \in \mathbb{C}^{d \times d}$, called an *observable*. By the spectral theorem, for all observables H we have the decomposition $H = \sum_{i=1}^k \lambda_i P_i$, where $\{\lambda_i\}_{i=1}^k$ $(k \leq d)$ are the eigenvalues of H and $\{P_i\}_{i=1}^k$ are the projectors onto the corresponding eigenspaces. The measurement defined by H has possible outcomes $\{\lambda_i\}_{i=1}^k$. Upon measuring a state ρ, the outcome λ_i is observed with probability $\text{Tr}(\rho P_i)$. As a consequence, $\text{Tr}(\rho H)$ is the *expectation* of the outcome upon performing the measurement H on state ρ.

Throughout this paper, we *only* consider observables H whose spectrum lies in $[-1, 1]$, *i.e.,* observables satisfying $H^2 \preceq I$. Furthermore, we assume throughout that Alice has n measurement choices given by the observables $M_1, \ldots, M_n$ and Bob has m measurement choices denoted by $N_1, \ldots, N_m$. Accordingly, if their shared system is in state ρ and Alice and Bob perform measurements M_i and N_j respectively, the expectation of the *product* of their answers is given by $\text{Tr}(\rho M_i \otimes N_j)$. The $n \times n$ matrix whose (i, j) entry is given by $\text{Tr}(\rho M_i \otimes N_j)$ is called a *quantum correlation matrix*, *cf.* Definition 4.2.

Tsirelson showed in [15] that, in the two-outcome case, the set of quantum correlation matrices *coincides* with the set of bipartite correlation matrices (*cf.* Theorem 4.1). This characterization has found numerous applications. As one example, this implies that one can optimize a linear function over the set of quantum correlation matrices (up to arbitrary precision) in polynomial-time, using semidefinite programming.

Additionally, Tsirelson studied the structural properties of the quantum state and the observables that are necessary to generate an extremal quantum correlation matrix. Roughly speaking, he showed that any quantum correlation matrix can be generated using observables $\{M_i\}_i$ and $\{N_j\}_j$, where all the anti-commutators $M_iM_j + M_jM_i$ are scalar multiples of the identity (and analogously for the N_j's). Moreover, he showed that for *extremal* quantum correlation matrices, such representations are essentially the only possible ones, *e.g.* see [15, Theorem 3.1] and [16, Theorem 3.8]. Using standard results concerning the representations of Clifford algebras, Tsirelson's work implies that the local dimension of a quantum system necessary to generate an extreme quantum correlation matrix can be lower bounded in terms of its rank.

Results of this type are very useful and quite rare. Specifically, they allow to prove lower bounds on the size of a quantum system necessary to optimally perform various distributed tasks, *e.g.*, see [14]. One such extensively studied framework are two-player *nonlocal games*, which mathematically correspond to optimizing a linear function over the set of quantum correlation matrices. The link between the system size and representations of extreme points stems from the obvious geometric fact that, the optimum of a linear functional over a compact convex set is attained at an extreme point.

4.2. **Relation to Tsirelson's work.** Using Theorem 1.1, in this section we recover Tsirelson's lower bound, *i.e.*, we show that the local dimension of a quantum system necessary to generate an extremal quantum correlation matrix can be lower bounded in terms of its rank, *cf.* Theorem 4.4.

This fact is well-known within the quantum information community. Nevertheless, our approach has two important consequences. First, the new proof based on Theorem 1.1 gives an alternative interpretation of Tsirelson's results by highlighting matrix factorizations of the elliptope as the underlying mathematical object.

Second, Theorem 1.1 is a strict generalization Tsirelson's lower bound. Roughly speaking, we will see that any extreme quantum correlation matrix can be completed in a unique way to a correlation matrix and moreover, this completion is an extreme point of the set of correlation matrices. Thus, lower bounds on matrix factorizations of extreme correlation matrices (such as Theorem 1.1) imply lower bounds on factorizations of extremal quantum correlation matrices (Tsirelson's work). At the same time, as the projection of an extreme point is not necessarily extreme, lower bounding matrix factorizations of extreme correlation matrices is a more general task.

We are now ready to explain the connection between quantum information theory and bipartite correlation matrices. The set $\pi(\mathcal{E}_{n+m})$ was studied by Tsirelson due to its relevance to quantum information theory. Algebraically, this is captured by the following result found in [15, Theorem 2.1]. We give a proof for completeness.

Theorem 4.1. *Let $C = (c_{ij}) \in [-1,1]^{n\times m}$. Then, $C \in \pi(\mathcal{E}_{n+m})$ if and only if there exist Hermitian matrices $\{M_i\}_{i=1}^n, \{N_j\}_{j=1}^m \subseteq \mathcal{H}_d$ and a Hermitian matrix $\rho \in \mathcal{H}_{d^2}$ such that*

(i) $M_i^2 \preceq I,\ N_j^2 \preceq I$, *for all* $i \in [n], j \in [m]$;

(ii) ρ *is positive semidefinite with* $\mathrm{Tr}(\rho) = 1$;

(iii) $c_{ij} = \mathrm{Tr}\left((M_i \otimes N_j)\rho\right)$, *for all* $i \in [n], j \in [m]$.

Proof. Let $C \in \pi(\mathcal{E}_{n+m})$ and consider vectors $\{u_i\}_{i=1}^n, \{v_j\}_{j=1}^m \subseteq \mathbb{R}^r$ satisfying $c_{ij} = \langle u_i, v_j\rangle$ and $\|u_i\|, \|v_j\| \leq 1$, for all $i \in [n], j \in [m]$ (such vectors exist by (17)). Then,

$$c_{ij} = \langle u_i, v_j\rangle = \frac{\operatorname{Tr}\left(\gamma_r(u_i)\gamma_r(v_j)\right)}{d} = \operatorname{Tr}\left((\gamma_r(u_i)\otimes\gamma_r(v_i)^\top)\psi_d\psi_d^*\right), \ \forall i \in [n], j \in [m], \tag{36}$$

where $d = 2^{\lfloor r/2\rfloor}$ and $\psi_d := d^{-1/2}\sum_{i=1}^d e_i \otimes e_i \in \mathbb{C}^d \otimes \mathbb{C}^d$. To prove (36), for the second equality we use (11) and for the third one that $\psi_d^*(A\otimes B)\psi_d = \frac{1}{d}\operatorname{Tr}\left(AB^\mathsf{T}\right)$, $\forall A, B \in \mathcal{M}_d$.

Conversely, consider matrices $\{M_i\}_{i=1}^n, \{N_j\}_{j=1}^m$ and ρ satisfying $(i), (ii)$ and (iii). Setting $A_i = M_i \otimes I$ and $B_j = I \otimes N_j$ for all $i \in [n], j \in [m]$ we get that

$$c_{ij} = \operatorname{Tr}(A_iB_j\rho) = \langle \rho^{1/2}A_i, \rho^{1/2}B_j\rangle, \ \forall i \in [n], j \in [m].$$

For all $i \in [n]$ let $\tilde{u}_i = \operatorname{vec}(\rho^{1/2}A_i)$ and $u_i = (\operatorname{Re}(\tilde{u}_i), \operatorname{Im}(\tilde{u}_i))$. For all $j \in [m]$ define $\tilde{v}_j$ and v_j analogously. As the entries of C are real numbers we get that $c_{ij} = \langle u_i, v_j\rangle$, for all $i \in [n], j \in [m]$. Lastly, note that

$$\|u_i\|^2 = \|\tilde{u}_i\|^2 = \operatorname{Tr}(A_i^2\rho) \leq \operatorname{Tr}(\rho) = 1,$$

where for the inequality we use that $A_i^2 \preceq I$. Similarly, we get $\|v_j\| \leq 1, \ \forall j \in [m]$. □

The algebraic representation of the set of bipartite correlations given above turns out to have *operational interpretation* within the context of quantum information theory.

Definition 4.2. *A matrix $C = (c_{ij}) \in [-1,1]^{n\times m}$ is called a* quantum correlation matrix *if there exist Hermitian matrices $\{M_i\}_{i=1}^n, \{N_j\}_{j=1}^m \subseteq \mathcal{H}_d$ and a Hermitian matrix $\rho \in \mathcal{H}_{d^2}$ (for some $d \geq 1$) satisfying conditions $(i), (ii)$ and (iii) from Theorem 4.1.*

We refer to any such family of matrices as a *tensor product representation* of C with *local dimension* d. In this section we use Theorem 1.1 to lower bound the local dimension of tensor product representations corresponding to extreme points of the set of quantum correlations.

As a first step we show that without loss of generality, we may only consider tensor product representations where ρ is a rank-one matrix. This is known but we give a short proof for completeness.

Lemma 4.3 ([13])**.** *For any $C \in \operatorname{ext}(\pi(\mathcal{E}_{n+m}))$, the minimum local dimension of a tensor product representation can be achieved by a rank-one representation $\rho = \psi\psi^*$ satisfying:*

$$\psi = \sum_{i=1}^d \lambda_i e_i \otimes e_i^* \in \mathbb{C}^d \otimes \mathbb{C}^d, \quad \lambda_i > 0 \ (\forall i \in [d]), \quad \text{and} \quad \sum_{i=1}^d \lambda_i^2 = 1. \tag{37}$$

Proof. The extreme points of the compact convex set $\{\rho : \rho \succeq 0, \ \operatorname{Tr}(\rho) = 1\}$ are matrices of the form $\phi\phi^*$, where $\|\phi\| = 1$. Thus, by the extremality assumption, for every tensor product representation of C we have that $\rho = \phi\phi^*$, for some vector ϕ with $\|\phi\| = 1$.

It remains to show that given a rank-one tensor product representation of C with local dimension d', *i.e.*,

$$c_{ij} = \phi^*(M_i \otimes N_j)\phi, \ \forall i, j \ \text{ where } \ \phi \in \mathbb{C}^{d'} \otimes \mathbb{C}^{d'},$$

we can construct another rank-one tensor product representation of C satisfying (37), whose local dimension is upper bounded by d'.

For this, consider a Schmidt decomposition of ϕ, *i.e.*, $\phi = \sum_{k=1}^d \lambda_k x_k \otimes y_k$, where $\{\lambda_k\}_{k=1}^d$ are strictly positive, $\sum_{k=1}^d \lambda_k^2 = 1$, and $\{y_k\}_{k=1}^d, \{x_k\}_{k=1}^d \subseteq \mathbb{C}^{d'}$ are orthonormal

vectors. Clearly we have that $d \leq d'$. Define the $d \times d'$ matrices $U := \sum_{k=1}^{d} e_k x_k^*$ and $V := \sum_{k=1}^{d} e_k y_k^*$, and note that the vector

$$\psi := (U \otimes V)\phi = \sum_{k=1}^{d} \lambda_k e_k \otimes e_k \in \mathbb{C}^d \otimes \mathbb{C}^d,$$

satisfies $\mathrm{Tr}(\psi\psi^*) = 1$. Moreover, as $UU^* = VV^* = I_d$, it follows that the Hermitian $d \times d$ matrices $\{\tilde{M}_i := UM_iU^*\}_{i=1}^n$ and $\{\tilde{N}_j := VN_jV^*\}_{j=1}^m$ have spectrum in $[-1, 1]$. To see this, recall that for any Hermitian matrix X, the condition $X^2 \preceq I$ is equivalent to $\left(\begin{smallmatrix} I & X \\ X & I \end{smallmatrix}\right) \succeq 0$. (*e.g.* by using Schur complements). By assumption we have that $M_i^2 \preceq I$ and $N_j^2 \preceq I$, for all i, j. Thus, we have that $\begin{pmatrix} I_{d'} & M_i \\ M_i & I_{d'} \end{pmatrix} \succeq 0$ which implies

$$\begin{pmatrix} I_d & \tilde{M}_i \\ \tilde{M}_i & I_d \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} U & 0 \\ 0 & U \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} I_{d'} & M_i \\ M_i & I_{d'} \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} U^* & 0 \\ 0 & U^* \end{pmatrix} \succeq 0.$$

Similarly, we get $\tilde{N}_j^2 \preceq I$, $\forall j \in [m]$. Lastly, an easy calculation gives that

$$c_{ij} = \phi^*(M_i \otimes N_j)\phi = \psi^*(\tilde{M}_i \otimes \tilde{N}_j)\psi, \quad \forall i \in [n], j \in [m],$$

and the proof is concluded. □

We now give the first application of Theorem 1.1 which is our main result in this section.

Theorem 4.4. *Given an extreme bipartite correlation matrix $C \in \mathrm{ext}(\pi(\mathcal{E}_{n+m}))$, the local dimension of any tensor product representation is lower bounded by $2^{\lfloor \mathrm{rank}(C)/2 \rfloor}$.*

Proof. By Lemma 4.3 we may only consider rank-one tensor product representations, *i.e.*, $c_{ij} = \psi^*(M_i \otimes N_j)\psi$, where $M_i^2 \preceq I, N_j^2 \preceq I$, for all $i \in [n], j \in [m]$ and ψ has the form given in (37). Set $K := \mathrm{vec}(\psi) = \sum_{i=1}^{d} \lambda_i e_i e_i^*$ and note that K is positive definite (and even diagonal) and satisfies $\mathrm{Tr}(K^2) = 1$. By (7) we have that

$$c_{ij} = \mathrm{vec}(K)^*(M_i \otimes N_j)\mathrm{vec}(K) = \mathrm{Tr}(KM_iKN_j^{\mathsf{T}}) = \langle KX_i, Y_jK \rangle, \tag{38}$$

where $X_i := M_i$ and $Y_j := N_j^{\mathsf{T}}$. Note that since N_j is Hermitian the same holds for Y_j.

Clearly $X_i^2 \preceq I$, and since a matrix and its transpose have the same eigenvalues we also have that $Y_j^2 \preceq I$. We now show that in fact $X_i^2 = Y_j^2 = I$, for all $i \in [n], j \in [m]$. Towards a contradiction, assume there exists $i^* \in [n]$ such that $X_{i^*}^2 \prec I$. Then,

$$\langle KX_{i^*}, KX_{i^*} \rangle = \mathrm{Tr}(X_{i^*}^2 K^2) < \mathrm{Tr}(K^2) = 1.$$

Thus, by vectorizing the matrices $\{KX_i\}_{i=1}^n$ and $\{Y_jK\}_{j=1}^m$, in view of (38) we get a C-system where one of the vectors has norm strictly less than one. Nevertheless, as $C \in \mathrm{ext}(\pi(\mathcal{E}_{n+m}))$, this possibility has been already excluded in Lemma 2.5 (*i*).

Since $X_i^2 = Y_j^2 = I$, for all $i \in [n], j \in [m]$, the matrix $\mathrm{Gram}(\{KX_i\}_i, \{Y_jK\}_j)$ is an elliptope completion of C. On the other hand, since $C \in \mathrm{ext}(\pi(\mathcal{E}_{n+m}))$, we have seen in Lemma 2.5 (*iii*) that C has a unique completion $E_C = \left(\begin{smallmatrix} A & C \\ C^{\mathsf{T}} & B \end{smallmatrix}\right)$ where $\mathrm{rank}(E_C) = \mathrm{rank}(A) = \mathrm{rank}(B) = \mathrm{rank}(C)$ and $E_C \in \mathrm{ext}(\mathcal{E}_{n+m})$. Consequently, we have that

$$E_C = \mathrm{Gram}(\{KX_i\}_i, \{Y_jK\}_j),$$

and the claim follows by applying Theorem 1.1. □

We note that Theorem 4.4 essentially follows from Tsirelson's seminal work [15], although it is not explicitly stated there (it is mentioned in [16] albeit without proof). Indeed, in [15] Tsirelson studies the properties of another family of matrix representations of quantum correlations called *commuting representations*, in the case where the

ambient Hilbert space is finite-dimensional or countably infinite. His main result is that for any $C \in \mathrm{ext}(\pi(\mathcal{E}_{n+m}))$, the matrices in a (nondegenerate) commuting representation correspond to a representation of an appropriate Clifford algebra [15, Theorem 3.1]. As a consequence, the dimension of any commuting representation of $C \in \mathrm{ext}(\pi(\mathcal{E}_{n+m}))$ is lower bounded by $4^{\lfloor \mathrm{rank}(C)/2 \rfloor}$ (for a concise proof of this fact see [5, Theorem 4.4] or [11, Theorem 25]). On the other hand, it is well-known and easy to see that any tensor product representation with local dimension d gives rise to a commuting representation of size d^2. Putting everything together we arrive at Theorem 4.4.

Interestingly, Theorem 1.1 generalizes Theorem 4.4 since there exist matrices $\left(\begin{smallmatrix} A & C \\ C^\intercal & B \end{smallmatrix}\right) \in \mathrm{ext}(\mathcal{E}_{n+m})$ for which $C \notin \mathrm{ext}(\pi(\mathcal{E}_{n+m}))$. To give a concrete example define

$$u_{ii} = e_i \quad (1 \leq i \leq r), \qquad \text{and} \qquad u_{ij} = \frac{e_i + e_j}{\sqrt{2}} \quad (1 \leq i < j \leq r),$$

and let E be the Gram matrix of the u_{ij} $(1 \leq i \leq j \leq r)$ ordered lexicographically. Using (15) one can easily verify that E is an extreme point of the $\binom{r+1}{2}$-dimensional elliptope. On the other hand, let C be the submatrix of E obtained by restricting to the first r rows and the columns indexed by pairs (i, j) in the range $2 \leq i \leq j \leq r$. Clearly, C is a $r \times \binom{r}{2}$ bipartite correlation matrix but it is an not extreme point of $\pi\left(\mathcal{E}_{r+\binom{r}{2}}\right)$. This is an immediate consequence of Lemma 2.5 (ii), since $e_1 \notin \mathrm{span}\left(u_{ij} : 2 \leq i \leq j \leq r\right)$.

References

[1] H. Barnum, J. Barrett, M. Leifer, and A. Wilce. A general no-cloning theorem. *Phys. Rev. Lett.*, 99:240501, 2007.

[2] A. Berman and N. Shaked-Monderer. *Completely Positive Matrices*. World Scientific, 2003.

[3] M. Deza and M. Laurent. *Geometry of cuts and metrices*. Springer, 1997.

[4] R. Goodman and N. R. Wallach. *Symmetry, Representations, and Invariants*. Springer, 2009.

[5] S. Gribling, D. de Laat, and M. Laurent. Matrices with high completely positive semidefinite rank. *Linear Alg. Appl.*, 513:122–148, May 2017.

[6] R. Grone, S. Pierce, and W. Watkins. Extremal correlation matrices. *Linear Alg. Appl.*, 132(537):63–70, 1990.

[7] M. Laurent and T. Piovesan. Conic approach to quantum graph parameters using linear optimization over the completely positive semidefinite cone. *SIAM J. Optimiz.*, 25(4):2461–2493, 2015.

[8] C.-K. Li and B.-S. Tam. A note on extremal correlation matrices. *SIAM. J. Matrix Anal. A.*, 15(536):903–908, 1994.

[9] T. Netzer and A. Thom. Polynomials with and without determinantal representations. *Linear Alg. Appl.*, 437(7):1579–1595, 2012.

[10] T. Netzer and A. Thom. Hyperbolic polynomials and generalized clifford algebras. *Discrete Comput. Geom.*, 51(4):802–814, 2014.

[11] A. Prakash, J. Sikora, A. Varvitsiotis, and Z. Wei. Completely positive semidefinite rank. arXiv:1604.07199, April 2016.

[12] D. E. Roberson. Conic formulations of graph homomorphisms. *J. Algebr. Comb.*, pages 1–37, 2016.

[13] J. Sikora and A. Varvitsiotis. Linear conic formulations for two-party correlations and values of nonlocal games. *Mathematical Programming Series A*, 2015.

[14] W. Slofstra. Lower bounds on the entanglement needed to play xor non-local games. *J. Math. Phys.*, 52:102202, 2011.

[15] B. S. Tsirelson. Quantum analogues of the Bell inequalities: The case of two spatially separated domains. *Journal of Soviet Mathematics*, 36:557–570, 1987.

[16] B. S. Tsirelson. Some results and problems on quantum Bell-type inequalities. *Hadronic Journal Supplement*, 8(4):329–345, 1993.

Appendix A. Omitted proofs

A.1. Proof of Lemma 2.4.

Proof. Let S denote the set in the right hand side of (17). Clearly, we have $\pi(\mathcal{E}_{n+m}) \subseteq S$. As S is a compact convex set, for the converse inclusion it suffices to show that every extreme point of S necessarily satisfies all the norm inequalities with equality. For this let $C \in \text{ext}(S)$ and assume towards a contradiction that $\|u_1\| < 1$. Select $\delta \in \mathbb{R}$ such that $\|u_1(1 \pm \delta)\| \leq 1$. Consider the $n \times m$ matrices C^+, C^- where $C^{\pm}_{ij} = \langle u_i, v_j \rangle$, for all i and $j \neq 1$, and $C^{\pm}_{1j} = \langle u_1(1 \pm \delta), v_j \rangle$, for all $j \in [m]$. Clearly, $C^+, C^- \in S$ and by definition $C = (C^+ + C^-)/2$. Thus, since $C^+, C^- \neq C$ we contradict the fact that $C \in \text{ext}(S)$. □

A.2. **Proof of Lemma 2.5.**

Proof. (i) This was shown already in the proof of Lemma 2.4.

(ii) Consider a C-system $\{u_i\}_{i=1}^n, \{v_j\}_{j=1}^m$. We only show $\text{span}(\{u_i\}_{i=1}^n) \subseteq \text{span}(\{v_j\}_{j=1}^m)$, the other inclusion follows similarly. Towards a contradiction, say there exists some $i^* \in [n]$ such that $u_{i^*} \notin \text{span}(\{v_j\}_{j=1}^m)$. Let P be the orthogonal projector onto $\text{span}(\{v_j\}_{j=1}^m)$. As $\|Pu_{i^*}\| < \|u_{i^*}\| \leq 1$, the vectors $(\{u_i\}_{i=1}^n \setminus \{u_{i^*}\}) \cup \{Pu_{i^*}\}$ and $\{v_j\}_{j=1}^m$ form a new C-system. Lastly, since $C \in \text{ext}(\pi(\mathcal{E}_{n+m}))$ and $\|Pu_{i^*}\| < 1$, this contradicts case (i).

(iii) Consider a C-system $\{u_i\}_{i=1}^n, \{v_j\}_{j=1}^m$. As $C \in \text{ext}(\pi(\mathcal{E}_{n+m}))$, by case (i) we have that $\|u_i\| = \|v_j\| = 1$, for all $i \in [n], j \in [m]$. This shows that $C \in \pi(\mathcal{E}_{n+m})$ has at least one completion in $\mathcal{E}_{n+m}$. The next step is to show that C it has a unique completion in $\mathcal{E}_{n+m}$. For this, let $\text{Gram}(\{u'_i\}_i, \{v'_j\}_j)$ and $\text{Gram}(\{u''_i\}_i, \{v''_j\}_j)$ be two elliptope completions. For $i \in [n], j \in [m]$ define $u_i = \frac{u'_i \oplus u''_i}{\sqrt{2}}$ and $v_j = \frac{v'_j \oplus v''_j}{\sqrt{2}}$ and note that they form a C-system. Thus, by case (ii) we have that $\text{span}(\{u_i\}_{i=1}^n) = \text{span}(\{v_j\}_{j=1}^m)$. In particular, for all $i \in [n]$ there exist scalars $\{\lambda^i_j\}_{j=1}^m$ satisfying $u_i = \sum_{j=1}^m \lambda^i_j v_j$. By the definition of u_i and v_j this implies that $u'_i = \sum_{j=1}^m \lambda^i_j v'_j$ and $u''_i = \sum_{j=1}^m \lambda^i_j v''_j$. Then, for all $i, i' \in [n]$ we get

$$\langle u'_i, u'_{i'} \rangle = \sum_{j=1}^m \lambda^i_j \langle v'_j, u'_{i'} \rangle = \sum_{j=1}^m \lambda^i_j \langle v''_j, u''_{i'} \rangle = \langle u''_i, u''_{i'} \rangle.$$

Analogously it follows that for all $j, j' \in [m]$ we have $\langle v'_j, v'_{j'} \rangle = \langle v''_j, v''_{j'} \rangle$. Putting everything together we get that $\text{Gram}(\{u'_i\}_i, \{v'_j\}_j)$ and $\text{Gram}(\{u''_i\}_i, \{v''_j\}_j)$.

For any $C \in \text{ext}(\pi(\mathcal{E}_{n+m}))$ we denote by E_C its unique elliptope completion. As the set of all completions of C is a face of $\mathcal{E}_{n+m}$ it follows that $E_C \in \text{ext}(\mathcal{E}_{n+m})$ (here we use the fact that the only way for a single point to be a face is for the point itself to be extreme).

Lastly, we have already seen that $\text{rank}(E_C) = \text{rank}(A) = \text{rank}(B)$. Clearly $\text{rank}(E_C) \geq \text{rank}(C)$ and it remains to show that $r := \text{rank}(A) \leq \text{rank}(C)$. Wlog assume that the first r rows of A are linearly independent. Then, $\sum_{i=1}^r \lambda_i \langle u_i, v_j \rangle = 0$, for all $j \in [m]$ implies that $\sum_{i=1}^r \lambda_i u_i = 0$ and thus $\lambda_i = 0$, for all $i \in [r]$. □

Acknowledgments. Both authors are supported in part by the Singapore National Research Foundation under NRF RF Award No. NRF-NRFF2013-13.

Nanyang Technological University, Singapore and Centre for Quantum Technologies, Singapore

E-mail address: aprakash@ntu.edu.sg

Nanyang Technological University, Singapore and Centre for Quantum Technologies, Singapore

E-mail address: avarvits@gmail.com